



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22311-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/034,499

12/28/2001

Andreas Dieberger

ARC920010063US1

1253

33360

7590

07/28/2006

MARK D. MCSWAIN

IBM ALMADEN RESEARCH CENTER, IP LAW DEPT.

650 HARRY ROAD

CHTA/J2B

SAN JOSE, CA 95120

EXAMINER

PITARO, RYAN F

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2174

DATE MAILED: 07/28/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/034,499

Applicant(s)

DIEBERGER ET AL.

Examiner

Ryan F. Pitaro

Art Unit

2174

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 February 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10, 13, 15 and 17-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-10, 13, 15, 17-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Response to Amendment*

1. This action is responsive to the communication filed on 2/2/2006. Claims 1-23 are pending in the application. This action is non-final and the finality of the previous rejection is withdrawn. Claims 1-10,13,15,17-23 are pending.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1,2,4-10,17-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Koike et al ("Koike", *Timeslider: An Interface to Specify Time Point*).

As per independent claim 1, Koike discloses a method for visualizing dynamic documents in a graphical user interface, comprising the steps of: generating a summary view (Figure 1) of at least one dynamic document including data from an ongoing process (Column 1 lines 15-17) and containing instances of search terms (Column 3 lines 45-50), using a condensed abstract representation of a search term density distribution (Column 3 lines 49-50) updating said summary view to reflect changes in

said dynamic document (Column 1 lines 32-34); and triggering an enhancement of said summary view by cursor brushing (Column 3 lines 40-44).

As per claim 2, which is dependent on claim 1, Koike discloses a method comprising the further step of navigating to at least one segment of said dynamic document by selecting a corresponding portion of said summary view (Column 1 lines 17-20).

As per claim 4, which is dependent on claim 1, Koike discloses a method comprising the further step of identifying said dynamic documents with at least one search engine (Column 3 lines 44-48).

As per claim 5, which is dependent on claim 1, Koike discloses a method comprising the further step of aggregating information to enable a more condensed abstract representation of said dynamic document (Column 3 lines 40-44).

As per claim 6, which is dependent on claim 1, Koike discloses a method wherein said method is performed periodically (Column 1 lines 16-18; *in periods which run one after another*).

As per claim 7, which is dependent on claim 1, Koike discloses a method wherein said method is performed continuously (Column 1 lines 16-18).

Claims 8, 22, 23 are individually similar in scope to that of claim 1, and are rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 9 is similar in scope to that of claim 2, and is rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 10, which is dependent on claim 8, Koike discloses a system where said dynamic document comprises at least one of: a text file, an image file, a web page (Column 2 lines 2-5), an audio file, a video file, streaming data.

As per claim 17, which is dependent on claim 8, Koike discloses a system wherein search terms include user-specified events defined by significant changes in said data from said ongoing process (Column 1 lines 16-18).

As per claim 18, which is dependent on claim 8, Koike discloses a system wherein the summary view includes a number of distinct regions, each region having a different resolution scale, enabling information to be depicted at different levels of detail (Column 2 lines 29-32).

As per claim 19, which is dependent on claim 18, Koike discloses a system wherein said resolution scale is a time scale (Column 2 lines 25-32).

As per claim 20, which is dependent on claim 8, Koike discloses a system wherein the abstract representation is nonlinear (Column 2 lines 25-26).

As per claim 21, which is dependent on claim 21, Koike discloses a system wherein said summary view depicts more recent events with higher resolution than less recent events (Column 2 lines 29-32).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 3,15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Koike et al ("Koike", *Timeslider: An Interface to Specify Time Point*) in view of Chen et al ("Chen", US 6,625,624).

As per claim 3, which is dependent on claim 1, Koike fails to distinctly point out computing a statistical summary of the contents. However, Chen teaches computing a statistical summary of contents of a selected document portion (Column 9 lines 44-48). Therefore it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to combine the method of Koike with the teaching of Chen. Motivation to do so would have been to provide an overview to better understand the primary areas of focus.

As per claim 15, which is dependent on claim 8, Koike fails to disclose the document being stock market information. However, Chen teaches the document to include stock market data (Column 9 lines 40-48). Therefore it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to combine the system of Koike with the teaching of Chen. Motivation to do so would have been to provide a way of tracking stocks.

1. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Koike et al ("Koike", *Timeslider: An Interface to Specify Time Point*) in view of Ayyar et al ("Ayyar", US 2002/0140722).

As per claim 13, which is dependent on claim 8, Koike fails to distinctly point out a system including data from a security system. However, Ayyar teaches a system wherein said dynamic document includes data from a security system ([0018] lines 1-18). Therefore it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to combine the security system of Ayyar with the system of Koike. Motivation to do so would have been to provide a way to identify or selecting sequences for individual cameras for use in the system of Koike.

### ***Response to Arguments***

The Examiner respectfully suggest to the Applicant a more precise claimed limitation than "search term density", while the Examiner is aware of what the Applicant is trying to convey, the Examiner believes that the prior art of record still reads on the claims since they are broad in the sense of density.

### ***Conclusion***


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ryan F. Pitaro whose telephone number is 571-272-4071. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:00am - 4:30pm Mondays through Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine Kincaid can be reached on 571-272-4063. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Ryan Pitaro  
Art Unit 2174  
Patent Examiner

RFP

  
KRISTINE KINCAID  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100